

RECORD OF COMMUNICATION		<input type="checkbox"/> PHONE CALL <input type="checkbox"/> DISCUSSION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FIELD TRIP <input type="checkbox"/> CONFERENCE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (SPECIFY) _____ <small>(Record of item checked above)</small>	
TO Dave Crawford EPA SCOM	FROM Tom Brown Burns & McDonnell	DATE 7/16/86	
SUBJECT Elliott Shooting Park, Raytown, Mo		TIME Site <u>Elliott Shooting Park</u> ID# <u>MO980900333</u> Break <u>2:1</u> Other <u>095B</u> <u>7/16/86</u>	
SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATION			
<p>During our meeting of several weeks ago with the property owner (Boatman's Bank), to whom B&M is acting as consultant, we asked them to submit a plan to us within 2-3 weeks regarding their plan of action for this site. During the meeting analytical data on samples collected and analyzed by EPA was shared and discussed.</p> <p>Tom called to discuss some analytical data on samples they have now collected from the site. Their samples were analyzed by Wilson Labs (which was a CLP on metals last time I checked). Tom said that the data they now have essentially confirms your data. The processed pile of soil contains about 1100 ppm lead, and would thus contain too much lead to leave at the site and comply with the Consent Order issued. Portions of the site where soil has been scraped off and then mined also has above 500 ppm lead. However lead continues to only be found in the top few inches of soil. Tom had analytical data where they had found lead in concentrations above 10,000 ppm in the top few inches, but less than 500 ppm in soil at a 5" depth. Tom felt that this meant that the lead on the surface has little or no potential to contaminate ground water. I said we had been agreeing with that but will continue to say that lead above 500 ppm in surface soils will be unacceptable in a residential setting.</p> <p>Tom had collected samples from the holding pond of sediments and found them to contain up to 3000 ppm lead. Previously we had no data on sediments in the holding pond. Tom said that they had looked at the accessibility of the holding pond and would take additional measures to restrict access to it (e.g. a better fence).</p> <p>I told Tom that I had received a citizen complaint alleging that runoff water from the pond is carrying lead off the site through the parking lot. Tom said that he had seen some sediment had been deposited in the parking lot from the runoff from the holding pond but had not seen any lead. I recommended that they pick up any sediment that has been carried off the site and take it back to the site.</p> <p>Tom had thought that during our meeting of a few weeks ago we (EPA) were trying to say that the mining process was not working and that it was not worthwhile to continue it. Processed soils contain more than 500 ppm lead, as do soils underlying the top few inches scraped off and mined. I said I had not thought that was what EPA was trying to say. I thought what we were trying to say was the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The mining process does appear to be resulting in substantial reduction in the levels of lead. -However it may not be the final solution. -Data we shared & which B&M has now confirmed indicates that levels of lead above 500 ppm may mean that additional cleanup will have to be done after the initial mining is completed. The Consent Order anticipates such a consequence & has provisions for the submission of additional plans, if necessary, after the mining if lead still above 500 ppm. -EPA was trying to share data with the PRPs, make them aware of potential consequences & significance of this data, and cause PRPs to do some contingency planning. 			
INFORMATION COPIES		OVER	
TO Craig/Gerhardt Braeckel CNSL/Paul Doherty ENSV SINV/		Larry Sheridan WATR/Ed Skowronski CDC	



CONTINUED FROM FRONT *

Tom agreed to go ahead and submit the data they now have to me. So far they have not developed any new plan of action in response to our data and their data. We agreed he should go ahead and submit data as soon as possible in order that we can all be reviewing the same set of data. Tom thought that he would get that to me yet this week.